

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of this application. Claims 1-25 remain pending.

Anticipation Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (Orr) (U.S. Pat. 6,463,459) in view of Slavin et al. (Slavin) (U.S. Pat. 6,675,193). The rejection is respectfully traversed. For the reasons put forth below, Applicant respectfully asserts that Orr in view of Slavin fail to identically disclose each and every feature specified in independent claims 1 and 6.

In support of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection the Office asserts that Orr et al. (hereafter Orr) teaches a method for enabling access to resources connected to client nodes of a network. This assertion is respectfully submitted to be incorrect. First, the Orr patent is directed to a thin-client/server computing architecture (Column 3, lines 43-46). Whereas, the independent claims 1, 12 and 21 of the claimed invention, are directed to a client/server architecture, where each client/server is a separate computer. Therefore, each client can act as a server where any one of the clients can provide resources to other clients thus acting as a server.

In the case of a thin-client/server architecture, the majority of the processing occurs at the server. The client is typically only involved with displaying the user interface and processing keyboard and mouse events and forwarding them to the server. Because the thin client does not perform intense processing, the software and hardware requirements for the thin-client are minimized. This in turn helps to reduce costs. (Column 1, lines 40-46). This implies that in Orr the client includes limited software and

hardware in order to reduce cost. Orr further states that, typically, in this architecture, multiple concurrent users log on and run applications in separate, protected session on a single server. Each separate, protected session is called a virtual desktop. Therefore, one user may be associated with multiple virtual desktops being displayed on one client, thus only needing one screen to control all virtual desktops (Column 1, lines 46-51). As such, the clients in Orr is incapable of providing access to any resources connected to the client nodes of a network. Only the server is capable of providing resources to the client.

Moreover, according to Orr, each time a user logs on to a client a virtual desk top 14 is created in the server 16. Communication within the server managed though two processes called virtual process broker (VP broker) and virtual process agent (VP agent). Both the VP agent and the VP broker are executed on the server. When the server receives a command request from a remote requestor, such as a remote host or one of the virtual desktops, the server directs the command to the VP broker and the VP broker directs the request based on the nature of the request. The request can be a VP agent connect request or a request from a remote requester. As can be seen, in Orr, each client is incapable of communicating with another client without the aid of server 16. The VP broker within the server determines how to direct the request. Orr requires an assigned server which is accessed by the all the clients to provide the processing power. Orr specifically states that the processing for the virtual desktop is performed in the server (column 3, lines 44-45).

Unlike Orr, the claimed invention is a method for enabling access to resources connected to client nodes of a network is provided. The method includes establishing communication between a local client and a remote client, in a client/server architecture. The local client provides a remote client identification code and a password to the remote client using a DCOM enabled link. The establishing process is completed when the

remote client confirms that the remote client identification code and the password match.

Subsequently, the local client is connected to a selected adapter that is connected to the remote client such that the selected adapter configured to appear on a GUI of the local client as if the selected adapter of the remote client were physically connected to the local client.

Next, the Examiner asserts that in Orr confirmation occurs if broker provides confirmed inter-process communication (IPC) resources and virtual desktop is started and provided to the client after logging in. Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. In fact, according to Orr, each time a client logs on a virtual desktop is created in the server and the VP agent is started within the desktop. Therefore, the Examiner is mistaken when he states that the server initiates a virtual desktop when the VP agent provides the log-on information. In Orr, the IPC resources are stored by the VP agent so that these resources may be used to communicate with the VP broker. There is nothing in Orr which indicates that the virtual desktop would not be started if the ID or password did not match.

The Examiner further states that connecting the local client to the selected adapter is inherently required in Orr once the virtual desktop is set-up to determine which adapters i.e. hard drive, CD-Rom, etc. local client has access to. Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to Orr, when the server receives a command request the server directs the command request to the VP broker. The VP broker determines whether the requested user is logged on. If the requested user is logged on, the VP broker determines the virtual desktop associated with the requested user (Column 4, lines 4-6). In Orr, the programs are run using the VP agent and not by establishing connection to a selected adapter and connecting the local client to the selected adapter as disclosed in the claimed invention. Depending on the type of request, the request is either handled by the VP broker or the VP agent. In Orr, the client does not have access to anything in the server besides the virtual

desktop. All the communication is managed through the VP broker and the VP agent. At least for the same reasons provided above, Orr inherently does not require the client to connect to the selected adapter.

Additionally, the Examiner asserted that virtual desktop, i.e., GUI, shows all applications and peripherals connected to the remote client i.e. server, as if they were located on the local client, i.e. client computer. However, this assertion is incorrect, the virtual desktop is not the GUI that shows all applications and peripherals connected to the server. In fact, virtual desktop is any user logged on session in a multi-user environment. (Column 3, lines 42-44). As stated above, the desktop includes VP agent that is capable of communicating with the VP broker, and through this communication, clients are able to access one or more common servers.

The Examiner acknowledges that Orr fails to explicitly teach transmitting information between a local client and a remote client using DCOM. However, the Examiner then cites Slavin, asserting that Slavin teaches a system for remote control of a local server system via a remote client, which utilizes DCOM. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of Slavin. The portions of the reference relied upon by the Examiner do not teach the local client providing a remote client identification code and password to the remote client using a DCOM enabled link, as defined by the claimed invention. According to the portion cited by the Examiner, client applications can be made to execute in any context that can host an Active X control. This has been accomplished by modifying the local runtime application, which is a window viewer (view.exe), to become a local server and to provide an Active X control object to host the server. Once modified to be a local server, the window viewer can be launched via DCOM programmers. (column 9, lines 19-29). Basically, Slavin is providing a way for a remote user to select an application for execution via the Web browser (column 6, lines

15-20). The selected application is then downloaded on to the client and the client executes the downloaded application.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr and Slavin as applied to claim 1, in view of Guheen et al. (Guheen) (U.S. Pat. 6,615,166).

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr and Slavin in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr and Slavin as applied to claim 1 and 7, in view of Kempf et al. (Kempf) (U.S. Pat. 6,374,308).

Claims 9-12, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr and Slaving as applied to claim 1 above, in view of McNeill Jr. et al. (McNeill) (U.S. Pat. 5,721,880). Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Orr, Slavin and McNeill Jr. Claims 16-17, 21, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr, Slaving and McNeill Jr. as

applied to claim 15, 16 and 21 in view of Kempf. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr, Slavin and McNeill Jr. as applied to claim 12 and 18 in view of (Guheen). Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr, Slavin, McNeill Jr., and Kempf in view of Guheen.

As explained in detail above, the Orr-Slavin combination fails to teach each and every feature of the independent Claim 1, of the claimed invention. Similarly, at least for the reasons stated above Orr fails to teach each and every feature of the independent claims 12 and 21. Claims 2-3 depend directly from claim 1. Since Guheen does nothing to cure the deficiencies described with respect to Orr-Slavin combination, applying Guheen to Orr-Slavin combination would not have resulted in a method for accessing resources connected to client nodes of network. Therefore, claims 2-3 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1 therefore, at least for the above stated reasons with respect to Orr-Slavin combination, claims 4-5 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, therefore, at least for the reasons stated above, claims 7-8 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr-Slavin combination, in view of Kempf. Moreover, Kempf does nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr-Slavin combination.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 1. McNeill, Jr. does nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr. Therefore, at least for the reasons stated above, claims 9-11 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr-Slavin combination, in view of McNeill Jr. Similarly, claim 12 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr-Slavin combination, in view of McNeill Jr. for the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. As claims 15 and 19 depend from claim 12, claims 15 and 19 are patentable 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr-Slavin combiantion, in view of McNeill Jr. Similarly, claims 13-14 depend from claim 12, therefore, claims 13 and 14 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr-Slavin combiantion, at least for the reasons stated above. Claims 16-17 are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr, Slavin, and McNeill as applied to claim 15, in view of Kempf. As claims 18 and 20 depend from claim 12, Claims 18 and 20 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr, Slavin, and McNeill as applied to claim 12 and 18 in view of Guheen at least for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Kempf does nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr, Slavin and McNeill Jr., therefore, Independent claim 21 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Orr, Slavin and McNeill Jr., in view of Kempf. Likewise, claims 22-25, which depend from claim 21 are patentable.

Additionally, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on a

combination of references, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or in the knowledge generally available to one having ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references in the manner proposed. As explained above, the Examiner has not established *prima facie* case of obviousness against the claimed subject matter because one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Orr, Slavin, Guheen, McNeill Jr., and Kempf.

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Orr, Slavin, Guheen, Kempf, and McNeill does not raise *a prima facie* case of obviousness against the subject matter defined in independent claims 12, and 21 because: 1) the combination is based on an improper comparison of the client/server architecture of the claimed invention with the thin-client/server architecture of Orr, 2) the requisite motivation to combine Orr, Slavin, Guheen, Kempf and McNeill in the manner proposed by the Examiner is lacking, and 3) Guheen, Kempf and McNeill do nothing to cure any of the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Orr-Slavin combination.

Thus Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 12 and 21. In a like manner, dependent claims 2-5, 7,8, and 9-11 which incorporate each and every element of the independent claim 1 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of the cited prior art for at least the same reasons discussed above. For the same reasons, dependent claims 13-20 which incorporate each and every element of the independent claim 12, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of the cited prior art. Similarly, dependent claims 22-25 which are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over any combination of the cited prior art since dependent claims 22-25 incorporate each and every element of the independent claim 21.-

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested .

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6926. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ROXIP142). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP


Jaya Nair, Esq.
Reg. No. 46,454

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 25920